

### REMARKS

In reply to the non-final office action mailed March 27, 2009, Applicants have canceled former claims 13 and 28-33. Applicants have also amended claims 1, 18, 21, 23-25 and 34 to more clearly and distinctly point out the subject matter of the claimed invention. Claims 1-12, 14-27 and 34-39 are pending. No new matter has been added by these amendments. Please consider the following remarks.

#### Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, 1<sup>st</sup> Paragraph

Claims 28-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph as lacking enablement. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that the specification, while enabled for treating Parkinson's disease does not reasonably provide enablement for treatment of all or any central nervous system diseases.

Solely to expedite prosecution and without acquiescing to the Examiner's position, Applicants have canceled former claims 28-33 and amended claim 34. Amended claims 34-39 now recite a method of treating a group of specific diseases or disorders. Applicants respectfully submit that the specification provides sufficient direction and guidance to enable one of skill in the art to carry out the methods recited in amended claims 34-39 without undue experimentation. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the above enablement rejection.

#### Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph

Claims 1-22 and 26-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that the recitation of "urea" and "thiourea" in claim 1 and its dependent claims is indefinite as it is not clear what is intended by these terms.

As discussed above, Applicants have canceled former claims 13 and 28-33. With regard to claims 1-12, 14-22, 26-27 and 34-39, Applicants have explicitly defined the structures that the terms "urea" and "thiourea" represent within the specification as

originally filed. *See* Original Specification, p. 12, lines 26-28. Specifically, “urea” refers to a compound of the structure  $\text{-NR}^{\text{X}}\text{-CO-NR}^{\text{Y}}\text{R}^{\text{Z}}$  and “thiourea” refers to a compound of the structure  $\text{-NR}^{\text{X}}\text{-CS-NR}^{\text{Y}}\text{R}^{\text{Z}}$ , wherein  $\text{R}^{\text{X}}$ ,  $\text{R}^{\text{Y}}$  and  $\text{R}^{\text{Z}}$  are each further defined within the specification. *See* Original Specification, p. 9, lines 21-25 and p. 12, lines 11-13.

Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize and understand that these terms, when read in light of the specification, specifically refer to radicals substituted on either amino with various substituents (e.g.,  $\text{R}^{\text{X}}$ ,  $\text{R}^{\text{Y}}$  and/or  $\text{R}^{\text{Z}}$ ). It would also be clearly recognized that the terminal bonds on the left hand side of each of the above structures serves as the point of attachment to the central molecule.

The Examiner further rejects claims 1-22 and 26-39 as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph arguing that the recitation of “urea, thiourea, sulfamoyl and carbamoyl” renders claim 1 and its dependent claims indefinite because these groups are “bifunctional groups” and it is not clear what else is appended to them. Applicants traverse.

As discussed above, the definitions of both “urea” and “thiourea” explicitly provide the structures referred to by these terms. In doing so the definitions also provide specific structures and variables of what else may be appended to them. *See* Original Specification p. 12, lines 26-28. The specification also contains detailed definitions for both “sulfamoyl” and “carbamoyl”. *See* Original Specification, p. 12, lines 10-13 and 22-23. “Sulfamoyl” refers to the structure  $\text{-SO}_2\text{-NR}^{\text{X}}\text{R}^{\text{Y}}$  or  $\text{-NR}^{\text{X}}\text{-SO}_2\text{-R}^{\text{Z}}$  while “carbamoyl” refers to the structure  $\text{-O-CO-NR}^{\text{X}}\text{R}^{\text{Y}}$  or  $\text{-NR}^{\text{X}}\text{-CO-O-R}^{\text{Z}}$ . Each of the variables  $\text{R}^{\text{X}}$ ,  $\text{R}^{\text{Y}}$  and  $\text{R}^{\text{Z}}$  are defined in the definitions section as discussed above. Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly recognize and understand that the terminal bonds of each of these structures (indicated on the left hand side) are the points of attachment to the central molecule.

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the above indefiniteness rejections.

Applicant(s): Hairuo Peng et al.  
U.S.S.N.: 10/552,304

**Conclusion**

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, which action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By:           /Catherine M. McCarty /  
Catherine M. McCarty (Reg. No. 54,301)  
LANDO & ANASTASI, LLP  
Riverfront Office Park  
One Main Street  
Cambridge, MA 02142  
Tel.: (617) 395-7087  
Fax: (617) 395-7070  
Attorney for Applicants

Dated: August 27, 2009  
Attorney Docket No.: B2047-7034US

949664